Page 1 1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 Case No. 13-12094-reg 4 5 In the Matter of: TUCCI EQUIPMENT RENTAL CORP., 6 7 Debtor. 8 9 Case No. 13-12180-reg 10 In the Matter of: 11 ANTHONY R. MARTUCCI, 12 Debtor. 13 14 15 United States Bankruptcy Court 16 One Bowling Green 17 New York, New York 18 19 September 12, 2013 20 10:14 a.m. 21 22 BEFORE: 23 HON ROBERT E. GERBER 24 U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE 25

```
Page 2
 1
     Doc. #2 Case Conference
 2
 3
     Doc. #22 Case Conference
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
     Transcribed by: Sherri L. Breach, CERT*D-397
25
```

Page 3 1 APPEARANCES: 2 LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT S. LEWIS, P.C. 3 Attorneys for Anthony Martucci, Debtor 53 Burd Street Nyack, New York 10960 5 6 7 BY: NICOLE L. PERSKIE, ESQ. 8 9 TORRE, LENTZ, GAMELL, GARY & RITTMASTER, LLP 10 Attorneys for First National Ins. Co. of America, a 11 member of the Liberty Insurance Group 12 2 Penn Plaza, Suite 1500 New York, New York 10121 13 14 15 BY: ROBERT BEAU LEONARD, ESQ. 16 17 LAZER, APTHEKER, ROSELLA & YEDID, P.C. 18 Attorneys for Capital One, N.A. 19 225 Old Country Road Melville, New York 11747 20 21 22 BY: JENNIFER L. SILVESTRO, ESQ. 23 24 25

Γ	Pg 4 0f 47
	Page 4
1	
2	NEW YORK CITY LAW DEPARTMENT
3	Attorneys for City of New York
4	100 Church Street
5	New York, New York 10007
6	
7	BY: ZACHARY B. KASS, ESQ.
8	
9	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
10	OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE
11	Attorney for U.S. Trustee
12	33 Whitehall Street, 21st Floor
13	New York, New York 10004
14	
15	BY: MICHAEL DRISCOLL, ESQ.
16	
17	SANKEL, SKURMAN & MCCARTIN, LLP
18	Attorneys for Valley National Bank
19	477 Madison Avenue
20	New York, New York 10022
21	
22	BY: CLAUDIO DESSBERG, ESQ.
23	
24	
25	

```
Page 5
1
2
    TIBBETTS, KEATING & BUTLER, LLC
          Attorneys for Michelle Martucci
3
4
          43 Corbin Drive
5
          Darien, Connecticut 06820
6
7
    BY: M. DAVID COMETTI, ESQ.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Page 6 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Tucci Equipment rental. 3 (Pause) 4 THE COURT: Okay. I remember some of you by face, 5 but I have to apologize that I don't remember names. I need 6 appearances. 7 MS. PERSKIE: Nicole Perskie from the Law Office of Robert Lewis on behalf of the debtor, Anthony Martucci, 8 9 who is to my left. 10 THE COURT: Okay. And that was Perskie? 11 MS. PERSKIE: Correct. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. 13 MS. SILVESTRO: Jennifer Silvestro from Lazer, Aptheker, Rosella & Yedid, P.C. for Capital One, secured 14 15 creditor. 16 MR. DRISCOLL: Good morning, Your Honor. Mike 17 Driscoll for the U.S. Trustee. 18 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Driscoll. MR. KASS: Zachery Kass from the New York City Law 19 20 Department on behalf of the City of New York. 21 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kass. 22 MR. LEONARD: Robert Leonard, Torre, Lentz, 23 Gamell, Gary & Rittmaster, LLP, attorneys for the surety 24 which is First National Insurance Company of America, a 25 member of the Liberty Insurance Group.

Page 7 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Leonard. 1 2 MR. COMETTI: Mario Cometti from Tibbetts Keating 3 & Butler on behalf of Michelle Martucci, the former spouse of the debtor. 4 5 THE COURT: Did you say Cometti? 6 MR. COMETTI: That's correct, Your Honor, Cometti. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 8 Okay. Everybody have seats except Ms. Perskie. I would like to --9 10 MR. LEONARD: Excuse me, Your Honor, if I may just introduce -- my client is here, also, Michael Bramhall (ph) 11 12 from Liberty. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. And that was Mr. Leonard, right? 14 15 MR. LEONARD: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 17 MS. PERSKIE: Your Honor --18 THE COURT: Yes. Come to the main mic if you would, please, Ms. Perskie. 19 20 MS. PERSKIE: I just wanted to mention first this 21 is the Tucci Equipment Rental matter. I don't know if 22 you're planning to appear on the personal matter, which is next on the calendar. 23 24 MR. COMETTI: Yes. 25 MS. PERSKIE: Okay. I just wanted to clarify

13-12180-reg Doc 29 Filed 10/14/13 Entered 10/23/13 16:00:57 Main Document Pg 8 of 47 Page 8 1 that. 2 Today is the second status conference we're having 3 on behalf of Tucci Equipment Rental Corporation and we have finally received funds. The debtor received a check for 4 5 \$59,000 for payment on a job that was performed prior to 6 bankruptcy. That is currently being held in his DIP 7 account. We're having some issue -- somewhat of an issue 8 coming up with the budget. The 59,000 that came in, we have 9 10 past due wages in the amount of \$39,252. That would be --11 THE COURT: Which is to workers on various jobs on 12 behalf of your client? 13 MS. PERSKIE: Correct, which were performed with -- within 180 days of the bankruptcy filing and that would 14 15 be compensating Mr. Martucci 10,000 out of the approximately 16 18,000 he's owed. If we were to pay the past due wages, 17 insurance is \$12,000. We've pretty much spent all of the 18 money the debtor has at that point. 19 THE COURT: Now is that a liability insurance, 20 casualty insurance, what kind? 21 MR. MARTUCCI: Liability -- general liability. 22 MS. PERSKIE: We've been in discussions --THE COURT: Pause, please. How much of the wages 23

due are to your rank and file as contrasted to your client's

principal?

24

Page 9 1 MS. PERSKIE: Ten-thousand is to the client's 2 principal. The other 29,252 are to various other employees. 3 THE COURT: So that's about 29,000 to what I called rank and file? 4 5 MS. PERSKIE: Correct. 6 THE COURT: Uh-huh. Keep going. 7 MS. PERSKIE: The issue we've had with this matter is I had posted an operating report, which was a to date 8 9 operating report just to kind of update everybody on where 10 we're at. My client's owed approximately \$1.2 million by 11 the city for various work that's been performed. All but 12 two jobs have been billed for already. But we have not 13 received funds on the other jobs. And determining the 14 status of this money has been next to impossible. I don't 15 know if there's a way for Your Honor to order something 16 where I could serve it upon, you know, the various parties: 17 The housing preserve, HPD, New York City of Parks, the City 18 of Yonkers. We're running --THE COURT: Have you talked to Mr. Kass about 19 20 trying to get that information without me ordering it? 21 MS. PERSKIE: I have not, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Well --MS. PERSKIE: I will discuss it --23 24 THE COURT: -- he's the lawyer for the city. I 25 would assume those agencies are under his wing or he would

know who to talk to. I'll -- I'll give you a chance to response, Mr. Kass, but that's --

MR. KASS: We -- we do represent those agencies.

THE COURT: Okay. That's a question that occurs to a judge, Ms. Perskie. You know, how -- how -- whether you might be able to advance this case by getting on the phone with these people.

MS. PERSKIE: Correct. I've -- I've made several phone calls. I have not spoken with Mr. Kass. I know Your Honor had put aside time for us to talk today and I was hoping that we could maybe get -- get status on some of the payments that I had --

THE COURT: Okay. Let -- let me just tell you something that I told a lawyer in another case yesterday where a lawyer was kind of in your shoes and was trying to deal with the IRS, and maybe there's no bureaucracy worse in the country than the IRS, but maybe the city agencies come into second place.

My experience has taught me that when you talk to the lawyers for these folks, the U.S. Attorney's Office, the Corporation Counsel's office, the A.G.'s office, you get much more thoughtful and quick responses than you deal with the bureaucratic agencies themselves. I asked, and either because of the bully pulpit (sic) or because he didn't want to annoy me or because it's the natural tendency of lawyers

to ask responsibly, when I said, can you deal with the U.S. Attorney's Office instead of the IRS, the A.U.S.A., the assistant U.S. attorney who showed up that day said, of course.

Mr. Kass -- I haven't put Mr. Kass on the spot
yet, but I will in a moment, and I would ask that you
communicate with him to try to resolve as much as you guys
can consensually without making me order things. And that's
with a full reservation of rights if you later agree to
disagree or if he can't help you.

It's at least possible that your client's survival will depend on collecting receivables, some of which may or certainly will be disputed and some of which may or may not be undisputed. But your tasks, it would seem to me, is to try to move your cases as quickly as you can with as little in the way of administrative expenses as you can, and it seems to me -- I -- that the best way to do that is to pick up the phone or to chat with people in person.

MS. PERSKIE: Your Honor, I have to be perfectly honest. When we chatted last time I was very discouraged by the City's response to a debtor being in bankruptcy.

THE COURT: Well, then, if you've tried and failed what I've suggested, then you've tried and failed. If you've got to, you can make a motion for a 2004 exam which -- to which there are very few defenses. Then you're into

Page 12 1 motion practice. You're into document production. You're 2 into depositions, all of which I'll give you. In my smaller cases I've found -- again, with the benefit of experience --3 that debtors don't often have the time or resources to 4 5 engage in that, but that's your call. 6 MS. PERSKIE: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 Do you have any further thoughts you want to share with me before I allow the other parties to be heard? 8 9 MS. PERSKIE: I do not have any further thoughts 10 to share at the moment. 11 Thank you. 12 THE COURT: All right. Who wants to be heard 13 next? Ms. Silvestro, you're the highest in the capital 14 15 structure. Do you want to be heard? 16 MS. SILVESTRO: Thank you, Your Honor. I did 17 speak with Ms. Perskie over the last two days regarding the 18 receipt of the check and the budget, and I have suggested to her a few different ways to possibly make some proposal to 19 20 my client as far as because there's not truly a monthly 21 income since the debtor isn't operating, but coming up with 22 some other different structure as far as as money comes in, 23 maybe a percentage or certain amounts would be paid in 24 different orders. 25 As soon as I get that, I'll certainly pass it onto

Page 13 1 my client, but I don't know how long my client's going to be 2 patient. 3 THE COURT: Yeah. I understand your client to be secured, but I've forgotten, is this on equipment that's 4 5 used in the business? Is this like --6 MS. SILVESTRO: It's a --7 THE COURT: -- personal property liens? MS. SILVESTRO: Blanket personal property accounts 8 receivable with a total of about a million-four --9 10 THE COURT: You got a lien on everything --11 MS. SILVESTRO: A lien on --12 THE COURT: -- effectively? 13 MS. SILVESTRO: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. I appreciate your 14 15 patience. 16 MS. SILVESTRO: Thank you. 17 THE COURT: Who wants to be heard next? Anybody? Mr. Kass, I need you to come up. 18 19 MR. KASS: Sure. 20 THE COURT: Help me as much as you can, please. 21 MR. KASS: Yes, Your Honor. The City is happy to 22 cooperate. I'm a little surprised at counsel's disappointment since we haven't heard from them since the 23 last status conference. I don't know where her 24 discouragement arose. I'll be happy to talk with her after 25

this and -- and see if we can work something out.

The City is interested in having the jobs have not been completed to be completed. The surety is here. There have been some conversations, I understand, between my litigation colleagues prior to the bankruptcy about that possibility. We would be happy if the debtor were to work with us cooperatively to see if we can work something out so that the surety would be in a position to go forward and be protected and be paid appropriately.

As far as what the debtor claims to be owed, the debtor commenced litigation pre-petition. Obviously, we're -- we responded in that forum. This is the debtor's litigation. Whether it's subject to the automatic stay is, you know, not before the Court at this time.

So on the other hand, as -- as I said, we're happy to attempt to cooperate, whether it's in terms of trying to figure out the situation, figure out what agencies had been billed for whatever the debtor claims, what counsel claims the City might have, and in terms of whether there's been some red tape that the debtor hasn't counted that we can help address.

THE COURT: Mr. Kass, I want to put you on the spot the same way I put the U.S. Attorney on the spot yesterday.

If I heard you right a moment ago, you said you're

willing to help cut through red tape and the message you're trying to tell me, whether or not Ms. Perskie would wholly agree with it or not is not yet clear, is you're trying to be a voice of reason in this process.

Can I enlist you to be the point person for the city agencies on exchanges of information and see if constructive progress on narrowing or eliminating disagreements can be achieved?

MR. KASS: Certainly, Your Honor. I would be happy to.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Leonard, if you were here before I don't remember it. I would like to get the surety's position.

Also, help me with the understanding of any bond or bonds you might issue -- or have issued. Are we talking about completion bonds or something different?

MR. LEONARD: Robert Leonard, Your Honor.

Yes. We're talking about two performance and payment bond projects which are the Washington Square Park Project and the Bronx Boulevard project. That's out of 15 that were listed on the monthly operating report that was filed yesterday by the debtor. Those two projects -- of those two projects, the Bronx Boulevard project is apparently not just substantially completed, but as close to final completion as -- as we can imagine, I believe.

Pg 16 of 47 Page 16 Washington Square Park is a bit -- has a little 1 2 more left to be done, but as I understand it, it is not work 3 to be done by Tucci's own forces as opposed to by subcontractors. As a matter of fact, I have been cautioned 4 5 that certain of the work has to be done by a licensed 6 nursery contractor which has to be a --7 THE COURT: Wait. A nurse -- you mean nursery 8 like shrubs? 9 MR. LEONARD: Shrubs, yes. It's --10 THE COURT: You need a license to --MR. LEONARD: -- Washington Square Park --11 12 THE COURT: -- grow shrubs? 13 MR. LEONARD: Apparently so. Yes, Your Honor. In fact, I think that was one of the disputes on the project at 14 15 one time. 16 THE COURT: Go on, please. 17 MR. LEONARD: So, actually, Liberty has been 18 funding these two projects and -- and especially the Washington Square project for almost three years now, and on 19 20 Washington Square Park Liberty is net out of pocket at this 21 point for Article 3-A Trust Fund items is approximately 22 \$550,000. The account receivables are -- I'm not quite sure

when it says amount here in the operating report exactly

what it is, but the number is about \$300,000. So that's not

going to reimburse the Article 3-A priority items for which

23

24

Pg 17 of 47 Page 17 1 Liberty of course is claiming a priority over the bank. 2 In addition, there's a \$220,000 lawsuit by Kelco 3 (ph) against Tucci and Liberty which I did not see mentioned in the list of litigation. It wasn't in the operating 4 5 report, but there was a list on a motion that was to be 6 submitted for, I think, joint administration today. 7 In any event, that action is pending in the Supreme Court of New York County. It is, of course, stayed 8 9 as against Kelco. But -- I'm sorry -- as against the 10 debtor. 11 I had spoken with Flora Edwards (ph), the attorney 12 in that action representing Tucci, the debtor. She has not 13 been retained yet to continue to represent Tucci in relation 14 to that particular lawsuit. The debtor has asserted, I 15 think, about a \$300,000 counterclaim against Kelco in that 16 action, apparently because the city rejected --17 THE COURT: Excuse me. Is Kelco the owner on the 18 job? MR. KASS: No. I'm sorry. Kelco was a 19 20 subcontractor --21 THE COURT: Oh, Kelco's a sub. 22 MR. KASS: -- which has a payment bond claim 23 lawsuit against --

-- against Liberty and the debtor in

24

25

THE COURT: Against your client?

MR. KASS:

Page 18 1 the State Court for --THE COURT: Okay. 2 3 MR. KASS: -- \$220,000. THE COURT: Do I infer from that correctly that 4 5 your client has paid some of the subs, but has not paid 6 others, and the others who have not been paid by your client 7 are going after you? MR. KASS: As far as I know just the one, Kelco. 8 9 We've paid everybody else as far as I'm aware. 10 THE COURT: I see. Okay. I'm -- I'm catching up to you now. And am I right in reading that your desire is 11 12 that the debtor be able to collect any receivables on the underlying jobs, but also for anything you shelled out to 13 subs you're subrogated to their rights and you have rights 14 15 against the debtor 16 MR. KASS: Certainly. 17 THE COURT: Yeah. I hear you. 18 If you were I, how would you cut through this knot and move this case forward? 19 20 MR. KASS: Well, there's one other item that I 21 wanted to mention which is that -- and you were speaking 22 before about technicalities and so forth and red tape. The debtor is still the contractor of record with the city on 23 24 both of these projects. They have not been terminated for 25 default or otherwise. The debtor will need to decide

whether to assume or reject the contracts, depending on a variety of factors.

And we are believing that probably the best course at this point would be for it to reject the contract so that it will no longer be the contractor of record and we can have our own -- and I think Liberty is -- Liberty had both an outside consulting firm, surety consulting firm working on this, but also now has its own in-house engineering staff working on this. And for the most part, the work has been done with the exception of a couple of subcontractors' work items. And I believe that that can be administered just as well by the Liberty staff and/or their outside surety consultants as by the debtor at this point.

Obviously, we would like to work with the debtor for all of the records and knowledge that they have in relation to the project. And to the extent that they want to pursue all these extra claims against the city, that would be good. I mean, the more money that can be recovered to repay Liberty, the better off we are. And we're not looking to make a profit, obviously. We're just looking to get the --

THE COURT: You're trying to cut your losses.

MR. KASS: -- loss back.

I'm sorry. There was one other --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I interrupted you. I

apologize. Continue. You were -- you were talking about things that you thought were -- would be constructive for the future of this case.

MR. KASS: Yes. I think the key -- of course, one key is the flow of funds, of course. But Liberty does not have a shortfall of operating capital, so at least for now we will advance the monies for the work to be done. The problem is that as was indicated in the operating report that was just filed, the debtor is -- if you look at the very first three questions: Is the business still operating, no; have you paid all your bills this month, no; have you paid your employees on time, no; have you paid your insurance premiums, no.

If you look outside, the weather is terrific.

This is the best time of year for there to be workers out there in the park planting trees and bushes, and it's not happening right now. And so we need to have something move forward immediately. I gather that the debtor's decision to accept or reject must be approved by the Court, and I assume that needs to be made on some kind of a motion or perhaps by stipulation.

THE COURT: Yes, but your second half was very true. And if this can be done by stip, with a non-object from the people in this room, unless I have some reason to believe that there's somebody who is not in this room, we

can do that real quick. And what we can do even quicker is approve a stip that like unties knots and has reservations of rights for parties on everything else.

So you were a step ahead of me. I didn't realize the desirability of taking advantage of the good weather and trying to get things buttoned up, but that sounds kind of common sense to me.

MR. KASS: Absolutely. If they miss this -- this next month and a half or so, two months then it has to go over to the spring which is not a good situation.

THE COURT: It's not a good situation in terms of cash flow for anybody and it's not a good situation in terms of taking advantage of when you can put people to work and get stuff done.

MR. KASS: Yeah. If I may, Your Honor, also, we do have an agreement of indemnity from the debtor, Tucci Equipment, under which the surety would have certain power of attorney rights and so forth. But we're always a little reluctant to use that in light of the automatic stay and so on and so forth. But we -- we would like to move this forward in one manner or another.

THE COURT: Could a stip modifying the stay to give you the avoidance of doubt be constructed?

MR. KASS: Quite possibly.

THE COURT: Okay. And would an expedited motion

Page 22 1 for relief from the stay if you can't reach a stip be 2 helpful if you can't reach the stip? MR. KASS: I did have that in mind and I have seen 3 such motions. 4 5 THE COURT: Uh-huh. Ms. Perskie, you've risen. 6 And I want to hear your perspective. I've got to tell you 7 guys that what I'm thinking is that a conference to see if 8 agreement can be reached on what Mr. Leonard suggested or 9 some subset of that might be in everybody's interest. 10 Can I ask you to step up if Mr. Leonard's done? Be -- before you go farther, are you done for the time 11 12 being, Mr. Leonard? 13 MR. LEONARD: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. 14 15 Ms. Perskie, your perspective. 16 MS. PERSKIE: Your Honor, my client is quite 17 agreeable. He would be willing to work with Liberty, 18 assuming it wouldn't affect his rights to the lawsuit he has pending against the city regarding Washington Square Park. 19 20 He has also, I guess, assigned in writing the payment from 21 the Washington Square Park job was assigned --22 MR. MARTUCCI: All -- all parks. 23 MS. PERSKIE: -- were assigned to Liberty Mutual. 24 THE COURT: All right. Well, it doesn't sound to 25 me like you want to go to war with Mr. Leonard or anybody

Page 23 1 else, other than preserving your rights right now and it --2 and avoiding prejudice to any claims you may have against 3 the city. Am I --4 MS. PERSKIE: Correct. THE COURT: -- correct? 5 6 MS. PERSKIE: Mr. Martucci would also like an 7 opportunity to be heard if the Court's okay with that. 8 THE COURT: Yeah. I'll allow that. 9 MS. PERSKIE: Okay. 10 THE COURT: Is that Mr. Tucci? 11 MS. PERSKIE: Martucci. 12 THE COURT: Martucci. I'm sorry. Oh, your client 13 is Martucci, but the company is Tucci. 14 MS. PERSKIE: Tucci Equipment. Our client is 15 Tucci Equipment. We were also going to represent Mr. 16 Martucci in his personal bankruptcy, but some information 17 has come to light that we may not be able to do so without a conflict of interest. 18 THE COURT: Yeah. I see that as a potential 19 20 issue. 21 But I'll -- is there anybody that objects to me 22 letting Mr. Martucci come up to a microphone? Come on up, Mr. Martucci. I -- I do want you to 23 24 understand that my focus today, though, is on the corporate debtor, Tucci Equipment Rental. 25

Page 24 1 MR. MARTUCCI: Yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: Go ahead. Keep the mic close to you 3 so I can hear you well. 4 MR. MARTUCCI: Good morning. Tucci Equipment has been in business for 27 years. In 2009, I decided to work 5 6 for New York City, the Parks Department. I took on two 7 projects for them and it was in Bronx Boulevard and it was 8 in Washington Square Park. 9 When I started those jobs, the payments weren't 10 paid on time. About a year after that in 2010, I tried --11 my lawyer, Flora Edwards, tried to contact the city and 12 everybody involved here to try and get everybody together 13 and figure out what to do about getting these parks to pay 14 their payments on time so we wouldn't be in a situation. 15 Time went by, time went by, and now we have 16 Capital One who is owed money. We have Liberty who is owed 17 money. I lost my wife and this is where I'm at. So the 18 problem is when we tried to contact the city, they turn 19 their back on us. I spent 45 minutes with Mr. Deblasio (ph) 20 in his office. He accepted a meeting with me. THE COURT: Who is Deblasio? 21 22 MR. MARTUCCI: Bill Deblasio. 23 THE COURT: The guy who's the mayoral candidate? 24 MR. MARTUCCI: Yes. He was --25 THE COURT: What -- what does he have to do with

Page 25 1 acting for the --2 MR. MARTUCCI: His --3 THE COURT: Oh, he's, what, the public advocate 4 now? 5 MR. MARTUCCI: Yeah. I went to the public 6 advocate to try and get help. They got nowhere. The -- it 7 seems to be that the Washington Square Park is a real highend -- was a real high-end project and they set a budget for 8 9 8 million and they won't go over it. It cost me 12 million 10 to do the project. So we put claims in with the city. I 11 have about 7 million in claims and we can't get the claims 12 to come to the table. It's been a year and a half now for 13 them to -- to get the claims to have a hearing. We can't even get that to happen. So if -- if we can get the claims 14 15 paid, all these people would be paid and I wouldn't be here. 16 I may not get my wife back, but I -- I -- you know, this is 17 where I'm at. 18 So that's why I wanted to speak today --19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 MR. MARTUCCI: -- so I could clarify. And -- but 21 as far as --22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MR. MARTUCCI: -- but as far as the jobs, all the 24 jobs are complete, finished. The only thing that's not 25 finished is a punch list for the plants, okay. And the comp

Pg 26 of 47 Page 26 -- my subcontractor, Kelco, refuses to go back and finish 1 2 it. So we have to find a different contractor to do it. 3 And when you find a different contractor, it costs you additional money when the original contractor is supposed to 4 5 do it for free. So that's where Liberty steps in and 6 they're going to pay. 7 So I hope I clarified things a little better. THE COURT: Okay. Fair enough. You do 8 understand, Mr. Martucci, that I can't decide any facts 9 10 today that might be disputed by anybody else. 11 MR. MARTUCCI: No. 12 THE COURT: I -- I wanted to let you just speak 13 your -- your peace and your mind. 14 MR. MARTUCCI: But this is the first -- this is 15 the first time that we've gotten everybody together and I 16 think it's a step further, you know. 17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 18 Has everybody had a chance to be heard on the corporate bankruptcy who wants to be? 19 20 Okay. Here's what we're going to do, folks. I'm 21 satisfied that at least the lawyers in this case are trying 22 to be helpful and are acting in good faith and share the

desire that I have to cut through bureaucratic red tape. I have a dim memory that the last time you were here I invited you to use my conference room behind the

23

24

court room to try to move the case forward. It's possible that I'm confusing this with another case, but I think it's this one. And I still think that that's a good idea.

Mr. Kass, I am grateful for your efforts to be the point person to enable Ms. Perskie and -- and maybe this would also involve Mr. Leonard -- to see whether facts that they need to -- and information they need to move things forward can be accomplished. And whether you call it professional responsibility or courtesy to me or whatever, I still think it's helpful and I'm thankful for it.

Mr. Leonard, it sounded to me like you had some constructive ideas for trying to give your client the ability it needs, and if I were in your shoes I might want to fight with someone who is writing out checks to move things forward to see if you can cut through red tape, too.

Any stips you guys enter, barring something unforeseen, are likely to be approved by me. Any such stips can and -- and should be drafted with reservations of rights on matters that you can't agree. But it still seems to me that you can move the ball forward in a number of useful areas.

Mr. Leonard, it didn't sound to me like you would need to move for relief from the stay because Ms. Perskie might be willing to meet your legitimate needs and concerns without a motion.

I would like you guys to sit down and see how, at the very least, we can button up the existing jobs, tee up any matters that would then be right for payment by the underlying owners, whether we can make progress with the city. I -- I'm not so naïve as to think that Mr. Kass's good will is going to solve all the problems with the city or it's going to make all the issues with the city go away, but I want to at least see what we can accomplish.

Anybody have any further thoughts you want to share with me before I move to the individual motion (sic)?

Mr. Leonard.

MR. LEONARD: Robert Leonard.

I just wanted to mention that with respect to the Kelco litigation, we are considering the possibility and have discussed this with Tucci's counsel, that it might be removed to the Bankruptcy Court. It's essentially a three-way dispute between -- for now -- among Kelco and Tucci and the city with, of course, the surety footing the bill one way or the other. If Kelco's work is determined to have been unacceptable to the city, then as far as we're concerned we should not be paying for it. On the other hand, if it was acceptable to the city, then we believe the city should be paying for it.

So either way --

THE COURT: Either way you --

Page 29 1 MR. LEONARD: -- we should not be --2 THE COURT: -- consider your client to be the 3 monkey in the middle. 4 MR. LEONARD: Yes, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MR. LEONARD: But right now I guess it's all just 7 under discussion. THE COURT: All right. Everybody's got 8 9 reservations of rights on that. I appreciate the head's up. 10 All right. Anything else, anybody? 11 Mr. Driscoll, I -- I haven't given you a chance to 12 be heard. I -- I suspect your view might be the same as 13 mine which is that you want the case to succeed, but that 14 there's a limit to what you can say or do at this point. Do 15 you want to be heard? 16 MR. DRISCOLL: Briefly, Your Honor. Thank you for 17 the opportunity. 18 THE COURT: Okay. MR. DRISCOLL: Your Honor, we have reviewed the 19 20 wage order and we have no objection, but that's pending if 21 -- whether Capital One wants to release that because that --22 all of that -- the monies that would be paid through its 23 wage motion are fully encumbered by Capital One's secured 24 claims. 25 THE COURT: So -- so it's not the issue that we

judges normally deal with on first day motions. And, of course, this is no longer a first day motion. You're not standing in the way, but you're saying that ultimately Capital One has to decide what it wants to do.

MR. DRISCOLL: That's -- that's my understanding,
Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DRISCOLL: We have reviewed this motion and it -- and it does comply with the statutory caps for paying all of the employees, including Mr. Martucci.

Going forward, there is the issue of conflict of interest between the Tucci case and Mr. Martucci's personal bankruptcy case. At present, we have -- the U.S. Trustee's Office has not come in and tried to stop the Lewis law firm from representing both entities. Typically, we take the approach that where there is a potential conflict of interest, just to be sure we would ask that one law firm does not represent both the entity and the individual.

However, we are aware of the economy's of this case. It is a small case. We do want to exercise our discretion, at the same time as making sure that the Lewis law firm was both disinterested and did not have an adverse interest to either estates. At present that's why we haven't stepped in and asked the Lewis law firm to perhaps seek a change, either step out of the case entirely or step

out of one case.

At this time we can't make that determination because we don't have enough information. It was -- it came to our attention at the April 23rd -- excuse me -- August 23rd 341 hearing in Mr. Martucci's personal case that there was potential loans that Mr. Martucci made to Tucci Rental. Whether those are just merely capital contributions or indeed notes backed by some sort of documentation we don't know yet.

We also don't know whether there are any potential Chapter 5 actions between either -- either estates that would render a actual conflict of interest with Mr. Lewis's law firm and Ms. Perskie.

So at this time, Your Honor, we can't make that determination. So I apologize that we're this far into the case and the U.S. Trustee hasn't stepped in, but we are doing our due diligence and trying to exercise reasonable discretion in not making a big deal out of something that might not necessarily be a big deal.

THE COURT: No. I think that's exactly the kind of answer that satisfies me. I was hoping, and you delivered on my hope, that you would take a balancing approach between making sure that conflicts don't gore anybody's ox, if I can use that expression, and protect the system while at the same time using common sense. I'm very

Page 32 1 satisfied. 2 I assume you're telling me that you're going to continue to monitor it and that if we move from potential 3 conflict to actual conflict you'll let me know and that's 4 5 fine with me. So I appreciate that, Mr. Driscoll. 6 Unless there are further thoughts you want to 7 share with me, that's just fine and I -- and let me express my appreciation for your handling it in such a thoughtful 8 9 way. 10 Thank you. 11 MR. DRISCOLL: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anybody else want to be heard on the -- at this point? 13 14 I do want to use whatever bully pulpit or muscle I 15 have to ask you guys to get together in my conference room 16 and see what you can do by agreement in the next hour or so. 17 Okay. Thank you, folks. 18 (A chorus of thank-you) MS. PERSKIE: Did you -- did you want to hear his 19 20 personal bankruptcy --THE COURT: Oh, forgive me, Ms. Perskie. Yes, I 21 22 do. 23 Could I impose -- anybody who is here solely on 24 the corporate matter is free to go into the conference room 25 now, but maybe it's better for everybody who might care

Page 33 1 about the individual 11 to also step up at this point and 2 for the others to continue to listen. 3 I have no memory of the personal 11 of Mr. Martucci. Is this the first case conference on it or did I 4 5 just forget from before? 6 MS. PERSKIE: Your Honor, this is the first case 7 conference on it. It was transferred from another judge to Your Honor. I made a motion yesterday -- or I made an 8 9 application I should say for joint administration of these 10 two cases. As you can see, there's many of the same people 11 involved in both matters and I believe it would save 12 resources for --13 THE COURT: Okay. MS. PERSKIE: -- the creditors and the debtor. 14 15 THE COURT: Have I signed a joint admin order yet? 16 MS. PERSKIE: You have not. 17 THE COURT: Has the time for objections come and 18 gone? MS. PERSKIE: No. It was filed yesterday. I 19 20 believe it's -- there's still time. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Because joint administration orders are merely administrative and enable me to see the 22 23 big picture and have no substantive effect at all on most 24 significantly emerging assets, I don't think it's likely 25 that there's going to be an opposition. I'm going to assume

Page 34 1 that there's going to be no op, but people's rights on that 2 are reserved. 3 MS. PERSKIE: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Cometti appeared on behalf of Mr. 5 Martucci's, is it at this point former wife or just estranged wife? What's the procedural context now, Mr. 6 7 Cometti? MR. COMETTI: Post-divorce (indiscernible). Ex-8 9 wife. 10 THE COURT: Okay. The divorce is -- is fully complete? 11 12 MR. COMETTI: Correct. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Is anybody else appearing in the individual case who hasn't been heard yet? 14 15 MR. DESSBERG: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Come up, please. 17 MR. DESSBERG: Good morning, Your Honor. Claudio 18 Dessberg representing Valley National Bank. THE COURT: Was that Dessberg, D-E-S --19 20 MR. DESSBERG: D-E-S-S -- D-E-S-S-B-E-R-G. 21 THE COURT: Okay. With a G like Gerber at the 22 end. 23 MR. DESSBERG: That is correct. 24 THE COURT: Okay. And you've got Valley what 25 bank?

Pg 35 of 47 Page 35 1 MR. DESSBERG: Valley National Bank. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. And Mr. Leonard? 3 MR. LEONARD: And Robert Leonard of Torre, Lentz, 4 Gamell, Gary & Rittmaster, LLP, attorneys for First National 5 Insurance Company of America, a member of the Liberty Group. 6 We are here because Mr. Martucci signed an agreement of 7 indemnity as an individual guaranteeing the obligations 8 which may arise in relation to the Tucci Equipment surety 9 bonds. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Fair enough. All right. Ms. Perskie, give me an update on the 11 12 status of this one. 13 MS. PERSKIE: As far as the status of this case goes, we were looking to see if we could make Tucci 14 15 Equipment profitable and have Mr. Martucci be able to 16 collect a regular salary from Tucci Equipment. 17 In regards to Valley National, I believe they have 18 a lien on 336 Beretto (ph) Street which is the current premises that the debtor in this case and the principal of 19 20 the debtor in the prior case occupies. 21 We've just recently been provided with an offer 22 for lease of that space and, perhaps, Valley National would be interested in signing off on that. There's some 23

equipment that would need to be moved from that location or

auctioned, but we were hoping to come to some kind of

24

Page 36 1 agreement --2 THE COURT: Pause, please, Ms. Perskie. 3 (Pause) 4 THE COURT: Continue, please. 5 MS. PERSKIE: We were hoping to come to some type of agreement with Valley National, perhaps a loan 6 7 modification, to handle that foreclosure. THE COURT: What communications have you had with 8 9 Valley National or its counsel? 10 MS. PERSKIE: This would be -- today would be the first time. I was just provided with the lease a couple of 11 12 days ago and there's been a lot of information to sort 13 through. I've been provided with a lot of the information 14 very recently. 15 THE COURT: All right. 16 MS. PERSKIE: They have not entered an appearance 17 on the docket yet either, so I wasn't aware they were going 18 to be appearing today. THE COURT: Did you know about Mr. Dessberg being 19 20 available as a resource before today? 21 MS. PERSKIE: I did not. 22 THE COURT: All right. Do other folks want to be heard vis-à-vis the status of Mr. Martucci's personal case? 23 24 Mr. Dessberg. 25 MR. DESSBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.

I just wanted the Court to be aware that there is a pending foreclosure action based on a mortgage loan made to a different entity that's not in bankruptcy called 336 Beretto, LLC, also owned by Mr. Martucci. Mr. Martucci was named as a defendant in that action since he personally guaranteed that loan.

We will most probably be asking the Court or possibly debtor's counsel, if we can stipulate to this, for a limited relief from the stay in order to proceed with that case limited to going against the property. The procedure under New York's real property actions and proceedings law is that in order to preserve any right to a potential deficiency judgment against guarantors or borrowers in the event that the foreclosure sale does not generate enough asset -- proceeds to satisfy the loan, those people have to be named in the action and they also have to be named in the final judgment.

That doesn't mean that we will be proceeding against Mr. Martucci personally. It's an option which arises only in the event that there -- the sale proceeds are not enough to satisfy the debt.

THE COURT: Do you have a sense as to the value of the property relative to the debt secured by the property?

MR. DESSBERG: Somewhat, Your Honor. The debt is approximately \$400,000. We believe the property is worth

Pg 38 of 47 Page 38 1 more than that. I believe the debtor has listed it as being 2 worth --3 THE COURT: We have so --4 MR. DESSBERG: -- a million-six. 5 THE COURT: -- many debtors here, I'm getting 6 confused as to which one we're talking about. 7 MR. DESSBERG: I'm sorry. Not the debtor. 33 --Mr. Martucci -- that's a different issue which I also wanted 8 9 to bring up to the Court. 10 Mr. Martucci's bankruptcy schedules, his personal 11 bankruptcy schedules list a lot of assets that are not 12 personal assets. They're corporate assets, including at 13 least two out of the three real estate properties. They're 14 not owned by Mr. Martucci. Mr. Martucci owns an interest in 15 a corporation which owns those properties. 16 Same with the bank accounts. All of the bank 17 accounts listed in Mr. Martucci's individual bankruptcy 18 schedules are, in fact, held by various corporate entities in which Mr. Martucci has an interest. The bank, Valley 19 20 National Bank and it appears several other creditors are 21 also listed as secured creditors when they're not, certainly 22 not Valley. We're unsecured in this case with respect to our claim against Mr. Martucci. He signed a personal 23

guarantee which is unsecured. And I believe the same

applies to some of the other --

24

Page 39 1 THE COURT: Pause, please --2 MR. DESSBERG: -- creditors. THE COURT: -- Mr. Dessberg. Were the schedules 3 4 that you were talking about that listed assets not of Mr. 5 Martucci personally but of corporations in which he had an interest, were they prepared by lawyers? 6 7 MR. DESSBERG: I believe by Mr. Lewis's firm. 8 Yes. 9 THE COURT: All right. Go on, please. 10 MR. DESSBERG: Now generally speaking, apart from a lot of confusion in the schedules and a lot of 11 12 inconsistencies, some creditors are listed as both secured 13 and unsecured. The amounts involved are sometimes 14 incorrect. Apart from all those issues which can probably be 15 16 resolved, I'm not sure where this individual bankruptcy is 17 going. Mr. Martucci does not appear to have any assets 18 apart from some small amount of personal property and his interest in his corporate entities. He lists his income as 19 20 zero. He claims he's received no income for the past two 21 years. He does -- he claims he has monthly expenses of 22 \$18,000. I'm not sure how this case is going to proceed to 23 a reorganization other than Mr. Martucci wanting his 24 companies to become profitable so he can be paid wages. 25 So potentially we -- we see this as going into a

Chapter 7 or possibly be dismissed down the road, but that remains to be seen.

THE COURT: All right. Now the matter as to which you're interested in the potential modification of the stay, that is against a corporation as to which Mr. Martucci's a guarantor?

MR. DESSBERG: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Uh-huh. All right.

And if I heard you right, there's a potential surplus in that property which, if there were a surplus, after your client were paid off then the value of that surplus would flow to the corporate obligor to you --

MR. DESSBERG: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- which would at least, in theory, provide value in the equity in that corporation. Is Mr. Martucci the equity holder or one of many equity holders?

MR. DESSBERG: I believe he's the 100 percent owner of 336 Beretto if I'm not mistaken, which is not in bankruptcy.

THE COURT: Now that would have two corollaries:

One would be that you wouldn't need to go after him on the personal guarantee or to file a claim in the 11 we have here because you were already paid off. The second, of course, would be that there might be some value in the stock which would be of use to the other creditors of Mr. Martucci in

this 11, or am I missing something?

MR. DESSBERG: Well, if there is a surplus, that would go to 336 Beretto Street, a separate entity which is not in bankruptcy. I suppose that company could be liquidated by Mr. Martucci and whatever asset -- whatever cash remains in the -- in their coffers would go to Mr. Martucci as the 100 percent owner.

So, yes. Potentially, years from now that could happen; that there would be some surplus monies that make their way to Mr. Martucci individually.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. DESSBERG: Currently, the -- this is in Bronx County. The foreclosure process is taking, I would say, an average of two years or more.

THE COURT: And how good are foreclosures in Bronx
County in getting top value for the underlying property, or
is this something where your client would simply be
intending to credit bid and then take the value of the
property and just account for the remainder under state law?

MR. DESSBERG: That I cannot predict, Your Honor.

It all depends on whether there are other interested bidders at the auction, whether the property has values to potential developers or buyers. The bank would bid in its mortgage or a portion of its mortgage at the auction, and the most it could bid in was the amount of the debt, which is

Page 42 1 approximately 400,000. 2 THE COURT: Uh-huh. Now is this the same or different property than Ms. Perskie was telling me she 3 wanted to have a dialogue with you about? 4 5 MR. DESSBERG: I don't know. 6 MS. PERSKIE: This is the same property I would 7 like to have a dialogue about. The loan is relatively small, I mean, 400,000. I can't imagine the arrears are 8 9 terrible and I would imagine if he had the building rented, 10 we could come up with some kind of plan to deal with the 11 arrears and get caught up to date. 12 THE COURT: Uh-huh. All right. 13 MR. DESSBERG: It's certainly --THE COURT: This -- this is one more area where 14 15 you guys need to talk. 16 Ms. Perskie, it may be that this is the first time 17 you've met Mr. Dessberg. If either of these cases is going 18 to succeed, you're going to have to be proactive in reaching out to the other parties, talking to them and either trying 19 to make deals or fail. But you -- you can't be passive on 20 21 this stuff. 22 So this is one additional thing for you to put on 23 the agenda of matters to discuss in the conference room. 24 MS. PERSKIE: Thank you, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Cometti, are there domestic

Page 43 1 support obligations that aren't being satisfied in this 2 case? 3 MR. COMETTI: Yes, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: How much are they? What's the nature 5 of the --6 MR. COMETTI: Tens of thousands. 7 THE COURT: Am I -- obligations of this character have both priority and non-dischargeability implications. 8 9 What's your game plan for dealing with those, Ms. Perskie? 10 MS. PERSKIE: Obviously, those would need to be 11 dealt with first. We have concerns about the amount of 12 alimony. It's -- it's \$8,000 --13 THE COURT: Concerns of what nature? Are --MS. PERSKIE: -- a month. 14 15 THE COURT: -- they fixed by a court order? 16 MS. PERSKIE: It was done per separation 17 agreement. 18 MR. COMETTI: Which was incorporated into a divorce decree, Your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: Yeah. I'm not an expert on domestic 21 relations law, but I was under the impression that that's 22 often the case. 23 MS. PERSKIE: And --24 THE COURT: So -- so the separation obligation was 25 converted into an obligation under the divorce decree, Mr.

Page 44 1 Cometti? 2 MR. COMETTI: That's correct, Your Honor. And there's no pending modification. There's no pend -- there's 3 -- the --4 5 THE COURT: Pull the mic closer to you, please. 6 MR. COMETTI: I'm sorry. The divorce was in the 7 State of Connecticut. Right now there has been a multitude of post-judgment filings in connection with the obligations 8 of support and alimony. As far as I'm aware, there's no 9 10 pending motion for modification. 11 So to the extent that there has been an expression 12 that the alimony is too high, all I can say is too bad. 13 There's an order that says -- that sets it forth. They have not made an application to reduce it. I'm not sure why they 14 15 would raise that as a topic here because this isn't the 16 proper venue for that -- those type of considerations. 17 THE COURT: Earlier in your remarks you mentioned 18 some kinds of motions that were going on. What were you 19 making --20 MR. COMETTI: Enforcement, contempt. THE COURT: Oh, in other words, you're on offense 21 22 and you're asking that the order as it now exists be 23 enforced? 24 MR. COMETTI: Correct. There's been continuing 25 for several years non-compliance.

Page 45 1 THE COURT: Okay. Does anybody have any further 2 thoughts they want to share with me before I ask that you continue in the conference room? 3 4 MR. DESSBERG: No, Your Honor. 5 MS. PERSKIE: No, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: All right. I don't know how many of 7 these issues, especially on the debtor -- individual debtor 8 side can be resolved without judicial intervention, but it's 9 obvious to me that there hasn't been enough talking in this 10 case. 11 See if you can make progress in my conference 12 room, and then I'm going to need to have a follow up 13 conference fairly soon. Get a date agreeable to all of you 14 from Ms. Blum (ph), and I want it in a three-week range. 15 Normally, I trail at least by 30 or 45 days. This case 16 needs more talk, not less. Get a date from Ms. Blum in the 17 three-week range. 18 And I want everybody in the conference room and 19 see what you can resolve. 20 MS. PERSKIE: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 22 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 11:08 23 a.m.) 24 25

Page 47 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sherri L. Breach, CERT*D-397, certified that the 4 foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the 5 proceedings. 6 Digitally signed by Sherri L Sherri L DN: cn=Sherri L Breach, o, ou, 7 email=digital1@veritext.com, Breach Date: 2013.10.14 12:37:06 -04'00' 8 SHERRI L. BREACH 9 10 AAERT Certified Electronic Reporter & Transcriber 11 CERT*D-397 12 13 Veritext 14 200 Old Country Road 15 Suite 580 16 Mineola, New York 11501 17 18 October 12, 2013 DATE: 19 20 21 22 23 24 25